



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,781

09/20/2005

Stefan Frenzel

P/2107/278

4925

2352 7590 09/04/2008
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, COLETTE B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/539,781	Applicant(s) FRENZEL ET AL.	
	Examiner COLETTE NGUYEN	Art Unit 4162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/18/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/17/05, 4/15/08</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claim 1-4, 6-12, 15, 16, 18-22, 27, 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders (US6,656,287) in view Schultheiss ("Processing of Sugar Beets with Pulsed-Electric fields. IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science, Vol. 30, No.4, Aug 2002).

3. Regarding claim 1 Sanders discloses a process system to produce sugar from plant materials such as sugar cane, sugar beets and chicory but he does not specify using electroporation. Sanders further explains the necessity to raise the pH up to 11.8pH to enable certain non-sucrose substances contained in juices to reach their respective iso-electric points. Schultheiss on the other hand, teaches a technique using electroporation on the large scale for the production of nourishment from food plants, such as sugar beets. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Schultheiss of electroporation for sugar beets with the teaching of Sanders of producing sugar from plant materials to achieve better extraction yields at lower temperatures, and savings in processing costs by minimizing the use of extracted solvents which have to be either evaporated, treated or

Art Unit: 1791

recycled and less energy. (Schultheiss pg 1547-1549 and Sanders Col.3 ,ln.45-49) .

Both teaching encompass the instant claim.

4. Regarding claim 2, Schultheiss teaches a method as claim 1, wherein the biological material in step (a) is subjected to a high voltage field in a conductive medium (Schultheiss : " *High voltage pulses with amplitudes of up to 300kV were created with the help of a six-stage low impedance Marx generator*")

5. Regarding claims 3, 4 Schultheiss teaches a method as claim 1 wherein, in step (b) the separation of the cell juice from the biological material is effected by mechanical loading, and wherein mechanical pressurization of the biological material is always less than 2 Mpa. Schultheiss teaches cold pressing, which is a screw press with 32 bar pressure for 15mn. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to design a screw conveyor to handle gently the plant materials to minimizing the juice loss. (pg 1549).

6. Regarding claim 6. Sanders in view of Schultheiss disclose a method as claim 1 wherein, in step (b), the biological material is supplied with at least one auxiliary substance.(Sanders, col,3, ln45-48)

7. Regarding Claim 7 , Sanders disclose a method as claim 1, wherein step (c) is carried out at a temperature of from 0-65C. (Sanders, Col.4, ln,38-40," *the clarification and purification or refining is undertaken at a temperature of between about 30 degrees Centigrade to about 40 degrees Centigrade*").

8. Regarding claim 8. Schultheiss discloses a method as claim 1 , wherein the biological material comprises at least one of sugar beet and sugar beet chips.

Art Unit: 1791

(Schultheiss:" *The standard procedure of sugar production from beets consists of carving the fruits into cossettes and subsequently extracting the juice from these cossettes..*").

9. Regarding claim 9. Sanders discloses a method as claim 1 wherein the biological material comprises chicory. (Sanders :" *the diffusion process, the milling process, other processes that remove juice from plant material, or bring plant juice into aqueous solution, result in a juice containing sucrose, non-sucrose substances and water...may include all manner of plant derived substances and non-plant derived substances...*"). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include chicory as it is also a plant material wherein the juice is found to be useful for health.

10. Regarding claim 10 and 11. Schultheiss discloses a device for isolating ingredients from biological material according to the method as claim1, said device comprising one appliance for electroporation, one full screw extractor arranged between the appliance for the electroporation and the extractor. (Schultheiss, pg 1548. "Experimental apparatus"). Wherein the full screw is designed as a conveyor screw and wherein a first section of the screw which is designed for receiving the material is formed at a lower point, and a second section of the screw which is designed for receiving the material is formed at an upper point, of a gradient which exist between said first and said second sections,.(Schultheiss. Fig1, 2). The inlet of the screw conveyor is at the low end and the discharge end is at the other end of the screw in an inclined position to save space and to feed the extractor hopper.

11. Regarding claim 12. Sanders teaches to use lime to adjust the pH during purification of the juice, ie the lime has to be metered to the extract. (Sanders, col 3, ln,52).

Art Unit: 1791

12. Regarding claim 13. See claim 3 above.
13. Regarding claim 15, Sanders discloses a method as claimed in claim 6 wherein the auxiliary substance is at least one of lime and milk of lime (Sanders, Col 5, ln, 41-45).
14. Regarding claim 16, See claim 7 above.
15. Regarding claim 18. See claim 1 above.
16. Regarding claim 19. Schultheiss in view of Sanders discloses a method as claim 18 with argument as claim 2 above.
17. Regarding claims 20, 21, 22. see claim 3 and 4.
18. Regarding claims 25 and 26. See claim 15 above.
19. Regarding claims 27, 28. see claim 7.
20. **Claims 5, 14, 17 ,23-24** are rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Sanders in view of Schultheiss as applied to claim 1, 10 and 18 and further in view of Hunt et al (4,323,007). Both Schultheiss and Sanders do not discuss the details of the feeding screw despite that both do use the screw conveyors for the process of extracting liquids or sugars out of plant materials such as sugar beets. Hunt, on the other hand discloses a method of extraction of juice_from fruits using a perforate extracting screw. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the extracting screw of Hunt in the method of Schultheiss as modified by Sanders to provide an efficient extracting method with a compact design to save costs in energy.

Art Unit: 1791

21. Regarding claims 5, 14, 23 and 24 Hunt specifically teaches wherein step (b) takes place in a screw (Hunt Abstract "*the use of the a screw press having a feed screw with a very gradual continuous slope of the body of the feed screw such that the fruit is gently compressed as it passes through the screw press*"), Hunt discloses that the juices of a fruit or plant materials can be collected in transition in the screw conveyor since it has a perforated trough. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to specify the perforated screw conveyor trough to maximize the recovery of the juices.
22. Regarding claim 17 Sanders in view of Schultheiss disclose a device as claimed in claim 10 above, and further in view of Hunt, wherein the full screw is threaded and at least one of an outer jacket of said screw and said screw threads is perforated. (Hunt, col 3, ln, 6-9.)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to COLETTE NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-5831. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 10:00-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer Mc Neil can be reached on (571)-272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Art Unit: 1791

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/COLETTE NGUYEN/
Examiner, Art Unit 4162

CN
July 31, 2008

/Melvin C. Mayes/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791